

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative during the telephonic interview conducted on April 26, 2007.

During the interview, aspects of the present invention not found in the cited references were discussed. It was noted that none of the cited references disclose or suggest that a portion of the air passageway extending from the fan (fan-supporting base) to the outlet of the air guiding member is unobstructed, as in the present invention.

Also, it was noted that none of the cited references show a "directional" aspect of the air guiding member, as generally set forth in claim 8 and as shown for example in Figs. 9 and 10 of the present application. Amendments of claim 8 to more clearly express this aspect of the invention were discussed.

It was agreed that amending the claims to clarify that a portion of the air passageway extending from the fan (fan-supporting base) to the outlet of the air guiding member is unobstructed, or to clarify (according to another embodiment expressed in claim 8) that the air passageway extends in a direction at an angle with respect to an airflow direction, guiding the airflow to a predetermined side of the air guiding member along the predetermined direction which is mis-aligned with a longitudinal direction of the air guiding member, would overcome the present rejections.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 9-12 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Taiwanese Patent 540,641 (hereafter "Taiwan '641") in view of U.S. 5,582,506 (Hong, hereafter "Hong '506"), and claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 11, and 12 presently stand rejected as being

unpatentable over Taiwan '641 in view of U.S. 5,522,700 (Hong, hereafter "Hong '700"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Taiwan '641 and Hong '506 nor Taiwan '641 and Hong '700 form a prima facie basis for obviousness of any of claims 1-13.

In particular, neither Taiwan '641, Hong '506, nor Hong '700 disclose or suggest a fan as set forth in claim 1 including an air guiding member including an annular sidewall that defines an air passageway between a first end and a second end of the air guiding member, such that the air guiding member is a single hollow member, there being no part of the air guiding member formed in the air passageway, the air guiding member including an air outlet proximate to the second end of the air guiding member beyond the fan unit, wherein the air passage-way is unobstructed from the fan-supporting base to the air outlet.

Instead, each of the cited references disclose obstructions between a fan-supporting base and an air outlet.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and claims 2-7 and 9-13 which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected as being unpatentable over Taiwan '641 and Hong '506 in view of either Ko (U.S. 2004/0201961) or Chen (U.S. 6,524,674). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claim 7, Applicant notes that claim 7 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, neither Taiwan '641 nor Hong '506 disclose or suggest the air guiding member as claimed wherein the air passageway extends in a direction at an angle with respect to an airflow direction, guiding the airflow to a predetermined side of the air guiding member along the predetermined direction which is mis-aligned with a longitudinal direction of the air guiding member. It is respectfully submitted that Ko and

Chen also fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature, and therefore fail to supplement the deficiencies of Taiwan '641 and Hong '506 as discussed above.

Claim 8 is rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim (original claim 1). Claim 8 is further amended to further define that the air passageway extends in a direction at an angle with respect to an airflow direction, guiding the airflow to a predetermined side of the air guiding member along the predetermined direction which is mis-aligned with a longitudinal direction of the air guiding member.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references disclose or suggest such an arrangement of an air passageway wherein the airflow is guided to a predetermined side of the air guiding member along a predetermined direction which is misaligned with a longitudinal direction (axis) of the air guiding member.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references, either individually or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 8, and therefore claim 8 is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 3, 4, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 3 presently stands rejected as being unpatentable over Taiwan '641 and Hong '506 in view of Katsui (U.S. 5,559,674). Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over Taiwan '641 and Hong '506 in view of Gan (U.S. 6,817,939), and Claim 13 is rejected as being unpatentable over Taiwan '641 and Hong '506 in view of Bendikas (U.S. 6,457,949). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 13 each depend from claim 1. As discussed above, Taiwan '641 and Hong '506 fail to form a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 1. Further, it is respectfully submitted that none of the additionally cited references (Katsui, Gan, Ko, Chen, and Bendikas) supplement the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Taiwan '641 and Hong '506. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 4, 7, and 13 are allowable over the cited references at least due to their dependency from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

New claims 14-20

New claims 14-20, depending from claim 8, have been added. It is respectfully submitted that claims 14-20 recite material which is novel and non-obvious in view of the prior art of record, and it is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 14-20 are fully patentable over all the references of record. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that claims 14-20 are allowable at least due to their dependency from claim 8.

Conclusion


In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-20 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: June 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

  
JOHN R. SCHAEFER  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,921